



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/597,016

06/20/2000

Liang Hong

65187-179

6072

22504 7590 12/04/2007
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP/Seattle
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
SEATTLE, WA 98101-3045

EXAMINER

LY, NGHI H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/597,016		HONG ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Nghi H. Ly		2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/19/07.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Harrenstien et al (US 7,085,553) and further in view of Pearson (US 6,885,862).

Regarding claims 1 and 9, Canada teaches a polling method for use in communicating information by a wireless transceiver unit to a wireless base unit (see column 1 lines 15-23), the polling method comprising: receiving an information request message over a wireless communication channel (see column 9, lines 30-43 and column 10, lines 36-57 and column 15, lines 45-63), sending information in response to the information request message (also see column 10, lines 36-57 and column 15, lines 45-63).

Canada does not specifically disclose repeating the receiving and sending on a regular basis.

Harrenstien teaches repeating the receiving and sending on a regular basis (see column 5, lines 4-6).

Art Unit: 2617

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Harrenstien into the system of Canada in order to provide a mobile-based client-server system that allows for the efficient transfer of information (see Harrenstien, column 3, lines 11-14).

The combination of Canada and Harrenstien does not specifically disclose the wireless transceiver unit and the wireless base unit configured to communicate over a wireless control channel and a wireless data traffic channel, receiving an information request message over the control channel, sending information over the control channel in response to the information request message.

Pearson teaches the wireless transceiver unit and the wireless base unit configured to communicate over a wireless control channel and a wireless data traffic channel (see Abstract, column 3, lines 22-37, column 3, lines 48-61), receiving an information request message over the control channel (see column 5, lines 55-61), sending information over the control channel in response to the information request message (see Abstract, column 3, lines 22-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Pearson into the system of Canada and Harrenstien in order to provide non-volatile storage of a partial program within each wireless subscriber terminal so that the wireless subscriber terminal need not receive an entire program in a single session (see Pearson, Abstract).

Art Unit: 2617

3. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Harrenstien et al (US 7,085,553) and further in view of Pearson (US 6,885,862) and Patel (US 5,315,636).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 11 and 14, the combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson teaches claim 1. The combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson does not specifically disclose polling is initiated in response to a detected problem.

Patel teaches polling is initiated in response to a detected problem (see column 3, lines 15-25 and column 10, lines 24-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Patel into the system of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson in order to enable a caller to contact a system subscriber at any location (see Patel, column 1, lines 1-12).

Regarding claims 8 and 17, Canada further teaches the information request message comprises data indicative of a requested information type and the information sent corresponds to the requested information type (see column 9 lines 30-43).

Regarding claim 15, Canada further teaches receiving the information from each one of the wireless transceiver units at random points in time (see abstract, "the system is communicating at any given time").

Regarding claim 16, Canada further teaches sending the polling request message comprises broadcasting it for receipt by a plurality of wireless transceiver units (see column 9, lines 30-43), the polling method further comprising: receiving information from each one of the wireless transceiver units at random points in time over a shared

Art Unit: 2617

channel (see column 14, lines 14-17, and see fig.1, link between box 6 and 8a, and link between 6 and 8c).

4. Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Harrenstien et al (US 7,085,553) and Pearson (US 6,885,862) and further in view of Patel (US 5,315,636) and Davies (US 6,058,420).

Regarding claims 4 and 12, the combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson teaches claims 1 and 9. The combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson does not specifically disclose initiating the repeated receiving and sending in response to detecting the communication failure (see Harrenstien, column 5, lines 4-6).

Patel teaches initiating the repeated receiving and sending in response to detecting the communication failure (see column 3, lines 15-25 and column 10, lines 24-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Patel into the system of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson in order to enable a caller to contact a system subscriber at any location (see Patel, column 1, lines 1-12).

The combination of Canada, Harrenstien Pearson and Patel does not specifically disclose detecting a communication failure on traffic channel.

Davies teaches detecting a communication failure on traffic channel (see Abstract, column 6, lines 60-63, see "failure" and "absence of a response", and see column 15, lines 54-56).

Art Unit: 2617

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Davies into the system of Canada, Harrenstien, Pearson and Patel in order to manage multiple customer networks and specially, to processes, apparatus, and systems used to construct management platforms consistent with Simple Network Management Protocol to manage multiple customer networks (see Davies, column 1, lines 21-27).

5. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Harrenstien et al (US 7,085,553) and Pearson (US 6,885,862) and further in view of Paneth et al (US 6,014,374).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, the combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson teaches claim 1. The combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson does not specifically disclose delaying a random period of time prior to sending the information.

Paneth teaches delaying a random period of time prior to sending the information (see column 21, lines 59-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Paneth into the system of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson in order to provide a system for the wireless transmission of multiple information signals utilizing digital time division circuits between a base station and subscriber stations (see Paneth, column 1, lines 20-23).

Art Unit: 2617

6. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Harrenstien et al (US 7,085,553) and Pearson (US 6,885,862) and further in view of Serikawa et al (US 6,347,092).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson teaches a polling method for use in communicating information from a wireless transceiver unit to a wireless base unit (see Canada, abstract and column 1, lines 15-23), the polling method comprising: detecting that a communication failure involving a wireless transceiver unit has occurred (see Canada, column 14, lines 53-56 and column 16, lines 18-48) and initiating the repeated receiving and sending (see Harrenstien, column 5, lines 4-6). The combination of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson does not specifically disclose tearing down a data traffic channel after detecting the communication failure.

Serikawa teaches tearing down a data traffic channel after detecting the communication failure (see column 36, lines 49-58, see "after", and see column 19, lines 17 to column 20, lines 1. In addition, see Applicant's remarks dated 07/26/2004, page 13, lines 13-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Serikawa into the system of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson in order to prevent collision (see Serikawa, column 36, lines 49-58).

Art Unit: 2617

7. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Serikawa et al (US 6,347,092) and further in view of Patel (US 5,315,636).

Regarding claim 18, Canada teaches a polling method for use in communicating information from a wireless transceiver unit to a wireless base unit (see abstract and column 1, lines 15-23), the polling method comprising: detecting that a power failure involving a wireless transceiver unit has occurred (see column 14, lines 53-56 and column 16, lines 18-48).

Canada does not specifically disclose tearing down a data traffic channel used by the transceiver unit in response to detecting that the power failure has occurred.

Serikawa teaches tearing down a data traffic channel used by the transceiver unit in response to detecting that the power failure has occurred (column 36, lines 49-58, see "after" and see "stop". In addition, see Applicant's remarks dated 07/26/2004, page 13, lines 13-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Serikawa into the system of Canada in order to prevent collision (see Serikawa, column 36, lines 49-58).

The combination of Canada and Serikawa does not specifically disclose polling the wireless transceiver unit for information in response to detecting that the power failure has occurred.

Patel teaches polling the wireless transceiver unit for information in response to detecting that the power failure has occurred (see column 3, lines 15-25 and column 10, lines 24-44).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Patel into the system of Canada and Serikawa in order to rationalized the data processing by transmit the accumulated data (see Patel, column 1, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 19, Canada further teaches polling comprises polling for information on a periodic basis (see column 16, lines 18-22).

Regarding claim 20, Canada further teaches polling comprises sending an information request message to the wireless transceiver unit over a control channel (see column 9, lines 30-43 and column 10, lines 45-57).

Regarding claim 21, Canada further teaches polling comprises sending an information request message (see column 9, lines 30-43) to the wireless transceiver unit and receiving information from the wireless transceiver unit, if available, in response to sending the information request message (see column 10, lines 36-44).

8. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Davies (US 6,058,420).

Regarding claim 22, Canada teaches a polling method for use in communicating information from a plurality of wireless transceiver units to a wireless base unit (see fig. 1 and see column 10, lines 21-56), the wireless transceiver units and wireless base unit

Art Unit: 2617

having one or more data traffic channels available for communicating high speed data there between (see fig.1).

Canada does not specifically disclose detecting, on a data traffic channel, a communication failure involving a wireless transceiver unit, and polling the wireless transceiver unit for information in response to detecting the communication failure on the data traffic channel.

Davies teaches detecting, on a data traffic channel, a communication failure involving a wireless transceiver unit, and polling the wireless transceiver unit for information in response to detecting the communication failure on the data traffic channel (see Abstract, column 6, lines 60-63, see "failure", "absence of a response" and "repolls", and see column 15, lines 54-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Davies into the system of Canada, in order to manage multiple customer networks and specially, to processes, apparatus, and systems used to construct management platforms consistent with Simple Network Management Protocol to manage multiple customer networks (see Davies, column 1, lines 21-27).

Regarding claim 23, Canada further teaches polling comprises polling for information on a periodic basis (see column 16, lines 18-22).

Regarding claim 24, Canada further teaches polling comprises sending an information request message to the wireless transceiver unit over a control channel (see column 9, lines 30-43 and column 10 lines 45-57).

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding claim 25, Canada further teaches polling comprises sending an information request message to the wireless transceiver unit (see column 9, lines 30-43 and column 10, lines 36-44), and receiving information from the wireless transceiver unit, if available, in response to sending the information request message (see column 9, lines 30-43 and column 10, lines 36-44).

9. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Fujioka (US 6,040,786).

Regarding claim 26, Canada teaches a polling method for use in communicating information from a plurality of wireless transceiver units to a wireless base unit (see fig.1 and see fig.2, antenna 406 for wireless connection), the wireless transceiver units and wireless base unit having a broadcast channel available there between (also see fig.1), the polling method comprising: sending an information request message over a broadcast channel for receipt by a plurality of wireless transceiver units (see column 10, lines 36-57 and column 15, lines 45-63), receiving information from each available wireless transceiver unit over a shared channel (see fig.1).

Canada does not specifically disclose receiving information from each available wireless transceiver unit at random points in time in response to sending the information request message.

Fujioka teaches receiving information from each available wireless transceiver unit at random points in time in response to sending the information request message (see Abstract and column 2, lines 9-22, where Fujioka teaches returning the response

Art Unit: 2617

signal at "the randomly selected time slot" and they read on applicant's "at random points in time". In addition, see **Answers.com** for the definition of "time slot").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Fujioka into the system of Canada in order to avoid the collision of response signals (see Fujioka, Abstract).

Regarding claim 27, Canada further teaches the information comprises status information (see column 10, lines 36-44).

Regarding claim 28, claim 28 is rejected with a similar reason as set forth in claim 26 above.

10. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al (US 6,301,514) in view of Jandrell (US 5,526,357).

Regarding claims 29 and 31, Canada teaches a polling method for use in communicating information from a wireless transceiver unit to a wireless base unit (see fig.1), the polling method comprising: receiving an information request message over a broadcast channel (see column 9, lines 30-43 and column 10 lines 45-57), delaying (see column 14, lines 23-31) for a random of time (column 14, lines 14-17, see "at any time", and sending information corresponding to the information request message (see column 9, lines 30-43) over a shared channel after delaying (see column 12, lines 47-51, column 10, lines 36-57 and column 15, lines 45-63). Canada does not specifically disclose delaying for a period of time in response to receiving the information request message.

Jandrell teaches delaying for a random period of time in response to receiving the information request message (see column 29, lines 5-9).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Jandrell into the system of Canada in order to provide a system for communication efficiency and minimizing the effect of multipath interference (see Jandrell, Abstract).

Regarding claims 30, Canada further teaches the information comprises status information (see column 10, lines 36-44 and column 15, lines 37-40).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 9-11 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that there is no motivation to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to do so found in the references themselves in order to provide a mobile-based client-

Art Unit: 2617

server system that allows for the efficient transfer of information (see Harrenstien, column 3, lines 11-14), *and* in order to provide non-volatile storage of a partial program within each wireless subscriber terminal so that the wireless subscriber terminal need not receive an entire program in a single session (see Pearson, Abstract) *and* in order to enable a caller to contact a system subscriber at any location (see Patel, column 1, lines 1-12) *and* in order to provide a system for the wireless transmission of multiple information signals utilizing digital time division circuits between a base station and subscriber stations (see Paneth, column 1, lines 20-23) *and* in order to prevent collision (see Serikawa, column 36, lines 49-58) *and* in order to manage multiple customer networks and specially, to processes, apparatus, and systems used to construct management platforms consistent with Simple Network Management Protocol to manage multiple customer networks (see Davies, column 1, lines 21-27) *and* in order to provide a system for communication efficiency and minimizing the effect of multipath interference (see Jandrell, Abstract).

On pages 9 and 10 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that arguments that the cited references are non-analogous art.

In response to applicant's argument that Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson are nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the references of Canada, Harrenstien and Pearson are

Art Unit: 2617

in the same field (i.e., polling in wireless communication systems), which are in the same field of applicant's endeavor.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-8:00pm Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 2617

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nghi H. Ly

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Nghi H. Ly', written in a cursive style.